



The Planning Act 2008

East Anglia One North (EA1N) and East Anglia Two (EA2) Offshore Wind Farms

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EA1N – EN010077, EA2 – EN010078

Deadline 6 – 24 February 2021

Comments of Suffolk County Council as PROW Authority

1. Post hearing submissions including written submissions of oral case

1.1 See SCC's composite Summary of Oral Case for ISH9.

2. Responses to ExA's Further Written Questions (ExQ2)

2.1 Not applicable.

3. Comments on the ExA's preferred dDCO or commentary on the dDCO

Schedule 3 - Public Rights of Way to be temporarily stopped up

3.1 From Pages 52: SCC confirms that the public rights of way, the extent of the proposed temporary stopping up and any substituted public rights of way are in correct locations and correctly described.

Schedule 4 - Footpaths to be stopped up

3.2 From Pages 66: SCC confirms that the footpaths, the extent of the proposed stopping up and any substituted footpaths are correctly described and in the correct locations, but a query has arisen over the location of the substituted footpath - Footpath Reference 36 as a result of submissions by the Applicant at Deadline 5. See point 4 below.

4. Comments on any additional information/submissions received by Deadline 5

Permanent Stopping up of PRoW

4.1 SCC has previously accepted the Permanent Stopping up of PRoW Plan (REP3-009 & REP 4-066), but submissions at Deadline 4 & 5 by the Applicant raise concerns and give rise to a possible objection by SCC to this Plan.

4.2 SCC seeks urgent clarification as to the proposed location for the new permanent public footpath provided under Article 11, Schedule 4 (REP5-004). SCC is very concerned that the Applicant has described the permanent diversion of Public Footpath no 6 at the substation site, as using a short section of Grove Road. This is stated by the Applicant in REP5-017 ID4 – Applicants' Comments on SASES D4 Submission and shown as such on the Figure 3, Appendix 1 – Clarification Note Noise Modelling REP4-043. It is unacceptable and unsafe to place walkers in the road and this further diminishes the value of this alternative footpath.

4.3 This contradicts the layout shown on the Permanent Stopping up of PRoW Plan sheet 7 of 12 (REP3-009) which depicts the new footpath as within the red line, adjacent, but not within the highway boundary of Grove Road. The description of the new PROW in the road does not accord with the SOCG LA 15.10 (REP1-072) in that the Applicant and Councils were considering amendments to the PRoW arrangements including 'amendment of the permanent PROW diversion route away from the edge of Grove Road and incorporation further within the proposed landscape planting', i.e. the diversion route was not described as being in the road.

4.4 The fact that Permanent Stopping up of PROW plan (App-014) depicted the diversion route as adjacent to Grove Road for much of its length was the subject of discussions with the Applicant in the SOCG meeting on the 18th March 2020. SCC made it clear that the diversion route appeared to map the new footpath in the roadside hedge and ditch which was unacceptable in terms of amenity and also had landscaping and drainage management implications. SCC also asked for the footpath to be screened from the road. The Applicant did not contradict SCC's conclusion.

4.5 The depiction of the diversion route where alongside Grove Road is the same on APP-014 as on REP 3 – 009 and at no point has this been shown or described as being in the road.

5. Notification by the Applicant, existing Interested Parties and Other Persons of wishing to speak at hearings in weeks commencing 8 and 15 March 2021

5.1 See separate SCC submission.

6. Responses to any further information requested by the ExAs for this deadline

6.1 Not applicable.